

09/643,583

- 5 -

BEST AVAILABLE COPY**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action mailed March 30, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-14 were previously pending in this application. No claims have been canceled. Claims 1, 7, and 11 have been amended. No new claims have been added. As a result, Claims 1-14 are pending for examination with Claims 1, 7, and 11 being independent. The application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to Claim 1 for containing a duplicated limitation. The first occurrence of the limitation "generates said quasi-static copy of said defined web page," in Claim 1 has been deleted. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Summary of Embodiments of Applicants' Invention

An example of one embodiment of Applicants' invention is described below to highlight some aspects of the invention. This embodiment is described primarily in Applicants' specification at page 5, lines 19-21; page 35, lines 1-5 and 29-33; and page 37, lines 1-13 as originally filed. It should be appreciated that the description below is merely an example of one of many embodiments that fall within the scope of Applicants' claims and is provided merely for the purpose of highlighting some aspects of Applicants' invention.

Prior art methods of generating dynamic web pages include the use of ASP code, which requires interaction with external sources, for example an operational database (page 35, lines 29-33). This may result in redundant requests of an operational database that result in slower system response times (page 5, lines 19-21). A method for efficiently defining and generating web pages is discussed. In the case of quasi-static web pages, the rate at which the dynamic data changes may be well defined, thus requests of the operational database may be definitively scheduled (page 37, lines 1-5; page 37, lines 11-13). An embodiment of the present invention makes use of two complimentary pieces of code, as seen in Figure 20, an executable code 1621 and a scheduler code 2061 (page 37, lines 6-10). The scheduler code is located within the web server 1519 and comprises information on which executables are to be executed and how often the executable code is to be executed (page 37, lines 11-13). Once a predetermined time interval

09/643,583

- 6 -

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

for scheduled dynamic update has elapsed, the scheduler may invoke execution of the required executable code (page 37, lines 18-23). Thus, before the time interval has elapsed, the quasi-static web page may be requested with the use of static HTML code (page 35, lines 11-14). Generation of a web page using static HTML code does not require use of the operational database. Thus, with use of the invention scheduler, the operational database may be relied on only when needed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,591,266 (Li), in view of Gauvin et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,061,686 (Gauvin), and further in view of Labounty et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,871,211. The Office Action rejects Claims 7, 8, 10-12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Labounty in view of Gauvin. The Office Action also rejects Claims 9 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Labounty, in view of Gauvin, and further in view of Helbig et al., U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0116257. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Discussion of Cited References:

Li illustrates a system for updating web pages stored in a cache, based on modifications to data stored in a database (abstract). The device of Li relies on a content change monitoring component to monitor and detect changes to data in a database management system (DBMS) (Col. 8, lines 36-41). Once a change is detected, the content change monitoring component determines which operation or queries will be affected by the changed data (Col. 8, lines 41-44). The monitoring component then presents the potentially affected queries to a CachePortal™ that in turn determines any web pages associated with the queries (Col. 8, lines 50-56). If it is determined that the associated web pages will need to be updated, the CachePortal™ sends an invalidate or refresh request to the appropriate location, resulting in the web server generating a new web page (Col. 8, line 61 – Col. 9, line 1). Thus, by continuously accessing the operational database, Li determines if an update is required.

09/643,583

- 7 -

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Gauvin illustrates a method of updating a copy of a remote document stored in a local computer system (Col. 1, lines 7-9). The method makes use of an auto-update function which is initiated once a downloaded web page is displayed on a client computer (Col. 5, lines 22-25). Once initiated, a copy of the web page is uploaded into a memory of an update server, from an origin server (Col. 5, lines 25-27). Once the client computer disconnects from the network, the update server periodically accesses the origin server to determine if the webpage is different than the update copy (Col. 5, lines 27-31). If a difference is detected, the update copy is modified to reflect the differences (Col. 5, lines 34-37). Thus, Gauvin determines if an update is required by continuously accessing the server.

Labounty illustrates a network based medical telemetry system where patient information may be supplied real-time from a central server to a workstation (abstract). Once a quasi-static web page is loaded from a web browser, an applet is loaded (Col. 7, lines 44-51). The applet opens a socket connection to a waveform server where the applet is able to send requests and receive data from the waveform server (Col 7, lines 54-59).

The Claimed Invention Distinguishes Any Combination of the Prior Art of Record:

None of the cited references taken individually or in any combination teaches or suggests scheduler code capable of invoking executable code, wherein the scheduler code includes *information on which executable code is to be executed and how often*, as is required by independent Claims 1, 7, and 11 as now amended.

Li instead teaches a monitoring system which continuously checks for data changes in a database management system. Li also teaches a CachePortalTM which is only activated by the monitoring system. Thus, neither the monitoring system nor the CachePortalTM in Li contain information on which executable code is to be executed or how often the execution is to take place as in the present invention as now claimed.

Similarly, Gauvin employs an update server which periodically checks an origin server to determine if an update copy differs from the actual web page. The update server in Gauvin *does not* comprise information on which executable code to use or how often to execute the code in contrast to the claimed invention.

09/643,583

- 8 -

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The system of Labounty provides data on a *real-time* basis. Therefore, Labounty does not teach or suggest the use of a scheduler code in contrast to the present invention.

Thus any combination of the cited references fails to teach or suggest "creating said scheduler code capable of *invoking said executable code* at predefined intervals, said *scheduler code including information on which executable code are to be executed and how often*," as is required by amended Claim 1. Thus, Claim 1 patentably distinguishes from the prior art of record. Claims 2-6 depend from Claim 1 and patentably distinguish for at least the same reasons.

Similarly base Claim 7 recites "...said scheduler comprising information on which executable is executed and how often..." and base Claim 11 now recites "a scheduler, including information on which executable are to be executed and how often...". As should be appreciated from the above discussion relating to Claim 1, amended base Claim 7 (from which Claims 8-10 depend from) and amended base Claim 11 (from which Claims 12-14 depend from) patentably distinguish for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these §103 rejections of Claim 1-14 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all pending claims (Claims 1-14) are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Mary Lou Wakimura
Mary Lou Wakimura
Registration No. 31,804
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 5/30/06